arXiv:1106.5233v1 [quant-ph] 26 Jun 2011

A complete proof of Korbicz et al [*Phys. Rev. A* 78 062105 (2008)] conjecture

Bang-Hai Wang[1,2] and Dong-Yang Long[1]
[1]*Department of Computer Science, Sun Yat-sen University,*
Guangzhou 510006, People's Republic of China and
[2]*Faculty of Computer, Guangdong University of technology, Guangzhou 510006, People's Republic of China*
(Dated: June 28, 2011)

We show a general method to construct finer and optimal entanglement witnesses. Based on this result, we show that there exist infinite entanglement witnesses or only an optimal entanglement witness for a given entangled state. Furthermore, We show that any entanglement witness W can be constructed from a separable density matrix σ in the form as $W=\sigma-c_\sigma I$, where σ is a separable density matrix, c_σ is a non-negative number and I is the identity matrix. Based on this result, we given a complete proof of Korbicz et al [*Phys. Rev. A* **78** 062105 (2008)] conjecture.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Ca, 03.67.Mn, 03.67.-a

Introduction.– Quantum entanglement has been incorporated as a central notion in the field of quantum information[1]. It allows us to realize various types of quantum information process, which are not achievable in classical physics, such as quantum computation[2], quantum dense coding[3], quantum teleportation[4], quantum cryptography[5], etc.

However, quantum entanglement is not yet fully understood by people. It is one of the central problems to check whether or not a state is entangled. Some necessary[6–13] or sufficient[14, 15]separability criteria, as well as the necessary and sufficient separability criterion for low dimension states[16], have been found. Unfortunately, there has not been any effective necessary and sufficient separable condition for an arbitrary state yet.

The most powerful method to detect entanglement may be the one based on the notion of positive maps[16, 17], i.e. a given state ρ on $H_A\otimes H_B$ is separable if and only if $I\times\Lambda\rho$ is positive for any positive but not completely positive (PNCP) map $\Lambda: H_B\rightarrow H_A$. Since PNCP maps do not represent physical processes, it is important to design methods to make the experimental detection of entanglement with PNCP map. The earliest [17] and most important one may be the structural physical approximation (SPA). It is based on the idea that a positive map will result in a completely positive (CP) map when it is mixed with a simple CP map. Since a CP map presents physical process, it can be implemented experimentally. Moreover, it keeps the structure of the output of the nonphysical map Λ. However, it is not easy to find PNCP maps[18]. An equivalent approach of identifying entanglement is based on entanglement witnesses (EWs)[1, 19]. EWs are observables that completely characterize separable (not entangled) states and allow us to detect entanglement physically[1].

EWs provide one of the main methods and the best known methods of entanglement detection in composite quantum system. Constructing the EW for an entangled state is an hard task, and the determination of EWs for all entangled states is a nondeterministic polynomial-time (NP) hard problem[20–22]. Concerning this topic, much work has been done (for example, Refs.[19, 21–24]). In this letter, we show a general method to construct finer and optimal EWs for a given EW. Moreover, we show there exist infinite entanglement witnesses or only an optimal entanglement witness for a given entangled state. Furthermore, We show that any entanglement witness W can be constructed from a separable density matrix σ in the form as $W=\sigma-c_\sigma I$, where c_σ is a non-negative number. Based on this result, we confirm Korbicz et al [*Phys. Rev. A* **78** 062105 (2008)] conjecture.

For our purpose, we first consider the quantum states on the finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{AB}=\mathcal{H}_A\otimes\mathcal{H}_B$. Let $dim(\mathcal{H}_A)=d_A$, $dim(\mathcal{H}_B)=d_B$ and $dim(\mathcal{H}_{AB})=d_{AB}$. We can also generalize our results to multipartite system and infinite dimensional Hilbert space.

A general method to construct finer and optimal entanglement witnesses for a given entanglement witness.– Recently, we have found that any EW W can be written as $W=\rho-c_\rho I$, where ρ is a density matrix and $c_\rho>0$ is a real number related to ρ [25].

For example, $\rho=\frac{p}{d_{AB}}I+\frac{1-p}{d_A}\sum_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle\langle j|\langle i|(0<p<1)$ is a density matrix, and

$$W=\rho-\frac{p}{d_{AB}}I=\frac{1-p}{d_A}V \tag{1}$$

is an EW, where V is the swap operator[26].

Furthermore, we get the following property of EW in this form.

Theorem 1. If an EW $W=\rho-c_\rho I$ can detect entangled state π, $W_i=\rho-c_{i\rho}I$ can also detect π, where $c_\rho<c_{i\rho}\leq c_\rho^{max}$, $\{i=1,2,\cdots\}$ refers to the index set and c_ρ^{max} is the maximum number in $c_{i\rho}$ which makes $W_i=\rho-c_{i\rho}I$ to be an EW.

proof: By $W=\rho-c_\rho I$ can detect entangled state π, we have

$$tr(W\pi)=tr(\rho\pi)-c_\rho<0, \tag{2}$$

$$tr(\rho\pi)<c_\rho. \tag{3}$$

By Eq. (3) and $c_\rho < c_{i\rho}$, we have

$$tr(\rho\pi) < c_{i\rho}, \tag{4}$$

$$tr(W_i\pi) = tr(\rho\pi) - c_{i\rho} < 0. \tag{5}$$

Since $c_{i\rho} \leq c_\rho^{max}$, $W_i = \rho - c_{i\rho}I$ is an EW and it can detect π. □

Following the definition in Ref. [27], we have (i) Given an EW W, $D_W = \{\rho \geq 0$, such that $tr(W\rho) < 0\}$, i.e. the set of density matrices detected by W; (ii) Given two EWs, W_1 and W_2, W_2 is finer than W_1 if $D_{W_1} \subseteq D_{W_2}$; (iii) W is an optimal entanglement witness (OEW) if there exists no other finer EW.

By Theorem 1, it can construct a finer EW than $W = \rho - c_\rho I$ to add an minor number to c_ρ, and we have following result.

Corollary 1. *$W_2 = \rho - c_{2\rho}I$ is finer than $W_1 = \rho - c_{1\rho}$ if and only if there exists $0 < \delta \leq c_\rho^{max} - c_{2\rho}$ such that $c_{1\rho} + \delta = c_{2\rho} \leq c_\rho^{max}$.*

We can easily find Corollary 1 coincides with Lemma 2 in Ref. [27] by computing.

Corollary 2. *$W = \rho - c'_\rho I$ is optimal if and only if $c'_\rho = c_\rho^{max}$.*

For example,

$$\rho_q = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1+q}{4} & 0 & 0 & \frac{q}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{1-q}{4} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1-q}{4} & 0 \\ \frac{q}{2} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1+q}{4} \end{pmatrix} \tag{6}$$

is the density matrix of $\pi_q = q|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + (1-q)I/4$, where $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ and $-\frac{1}{3} < q < 0$. By computing[25], $c_{\rho_q}^{max} = \frac{1+q}{4}$. $W = \rho_q - \frac{1+q}{4}I$ is optimal and can detect $\pi_p = p|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + (1-p)I/4$, where $p > \frac{1}{3}$. Since $\frac{1+3q}{4} < \frac{1+2q}{4} < \frac{1+q}{4}$, $W = \rho_q - \frac{1+2q}{4}I$ can detect π_p for $p > \frac{2}{3}$, where $\frac{1+3q}{4}$ is the minimum eigenvalue of ρ_q.

Following [25], we can get the general procedure of constructing optimal entanglement witnesses for $W = \rho - c_\rho I$ by computing c_ρ^{max}.

Following [27], to compare the action of different EWs, the normalization condition of EW is on demand. We can normalize $W_1 = \rho - c_{1\rho}I$ and $W_2 = \rho - c_{2\rho}I$ such that $W_1' = \frac{1}{1 - c_{1\rho}d_{AB}}(\rho - c_{1\rho}I)$ and $W_2' = \frac{1}{1 - c_{2\rho}d_{AB}}(\rho - c_{2\rho}I)$. Clearly, if $c_{1\rho} \neq c_{2\rho}$, W_1 is different from W_2. However, there exist an infinite number of real numbers between $c_{1\rho}$ and $c_{2\rho}$. It is known that there exist at least one entanglement witness for a given entangled state [16, 22], and we can get the following result.

Corollary 3. *For a given entangled state, there exist an infinite number of entanglement witnesses or only an optimal entanglement witness.*

Constructing all entanglement witnesses from separable density matrices.– According to the property of EWs and the relation between any density matrix and a separable density matrix, we find the general form of EWs in [25] can be written as the form related to separable density matrices.

Theorem 2. *Any bipartite density matrix π is entangled if and only if there exists a separable state σ and a non-negative number c_σ such that the operator*

$$W = \sigma - c_\sigma I \tag{7}$$

satisfies $Tr(W\pi) < 0$ and $Tr(W\sigma') \geqslant 0$ for all separable states σ'.

proof: Following Ref. [25] for any EW W', there exists a density matrix ρ such that

$$W' = \rho - c_\rho I. \tag{8}$$

Observe the depolarizing channel[28]

$$\tilde{\rho}_p = p\frac{I}{d_{AB}} + (1-p)\rho. \tag{9}$$

By Eq. (8) and Eq.(9),

$$(1-p)\rho = \tilde{\rho}_p - p\frac{I}{d_{AB}} \tag{10}$$

$$(1-p)\rho - (1-p)c_\rho I = \tilde{\rho}_p - p\frac{I}{d_{AB}} - (1-p)c_\rho I \tag{11}$$

$$(1-p)(\rho - c_\rho I) = \tilde{\rho}_p - ((1-p)c_\rho + \frac{p}{d_{AB}})I \tag{12}$$

$$(1-p)W' = \tilde{\rho}_p - ((1-p)c_\rho + \frac{p}{d_{AB}})I \tag{13}$$

It is known that the right-hand-side of inequality in Eq. (13) is the same EW as W' [25]. Considering the right-hand-side of inequality in Eq. (13), for sufficiently small values of $p \leq p_s$, the state $\tilde{\rho}_p$ becomes a separable state σ for any ρ[14, 29–31]. Therefore, for any EW $W' = \rho - c_\rho I$, there exists the same EW as W', $W = \sigma - c_\sigma I$, where σ is a separable state and c_σ is a nonnegative real number. □

*Complete proof of Korbicz et al [*Phys. Rev. A **78** *062105 (2008)] conjecture.–* Recently, a conjecture that SPA to optimal positive maps correspond to entanglement-breaking maps (channels) has been posed in Ref.[32]. An equivalent presentation of the conjecture is that SPA to optimal entanglement witnesses correspond to separable (unnormalized) states, i.e. the SPA to an optimal EW W^{opt},

$$\tilde{W} = \frac{p}{d_{AB}}I + (1-p)W^{opt}. \tag{14}$$

is separable where p is the smallest parameter for which $\tilde{W}$ is a positive operator (possibly unnormalized state)[23]. Considering possibly unnormalization of state, the conjecture can be simplified to that

$$\tilde{W} = W^{opt} + sI \tag{15}$$

is separable where $s > 0$ is the smallest parameter for which $\tilde{W}$ is a positive operator (possibly unnormalized state).

Very recently, the conjecture was supported by new classes of optimal entanglement witnesses[17, 23, 24].

Lemma 1. [33]ρ_t is separable for every $t \in [0,1]$ if and only if ρ is separable, where

$$\rho_t = \frac{1-t}{d_{AB}} I + t\rho \tag{16}$$

.

Lemma 2. If σ is separable and $0 < \lambda_\sigma < \frac{1}{d_{AB}}$,

$$\sigma_\lambda = \sigma - \lambda_\sigma I \tag{17}$$

is also separable without considering normalization.

proof: By Eq. (16),

$$t\rho = \rho_t - \frac{1-t}{d_{AB}} I. \tag{18}$$

Let $\frac{1-t}{d_{AB}} = \lambda_\sigma$. By $0 < \lambda_\sigma < \frac{1}{d_{AB}}$, we have $0 < t < 1$.

By Lemma 1, ρ is separable if and only if ρ_t is separable for $0 < t < 1$ in Eq. (18), i.e. $t\rho$ is separable if and only if ρ_t is separable for $0 < t < 1$.

Let $\rho_t = \sigma$. Therefore, if σ is separable and $0 < \lambda_\sigma < \frac{1}{d_{AB}}$, $\sigma_\lambda = \sigma - \lambda_\sigma I$ is separable. ☐

Theorem 3. The SPA to an optimal EW W^{opt},

$$\tilde{W} = W^{opt} + sI \tag{19}$$

is a separable (possibly unnormalized) state.

proof: By Theorem 2, there exists and only exists a separable state σ such that

$$W^{opt} = \sigma - c_\sigma^{max} I \tag{20}$$

for an optimal entanglement witness W^{opt}.

By Eq. (19) and Eq.(20), We have

$$\tilde{W} = \sigma + (s - c_\sigma^{max}) I \tag{21}$$

By Ref. [25], $c_\sigma^{max} > \lambda_0(\sigma) > 0$, where $\lambda_0(\sigma)$ is the minimum eigenvalue of σ.

By the property of sate correspond to SPA to optimal entanglement witness, i.e. $\tilde{W} \geq 0$, we have $s - c_\sigma^{max} = -\lambda_0(\sigma)$, and

$$\tilde{W} = \sigma - \lambda_0(\sigma) I. \tag{22}$$

Clearly, $0 < \lambda_0(\sigma) < \frac{1}{d_{AB}}$. Note that the minimum eigenvalue of σ can be equal to $\frac{1}{d_{AB}}$. However, by Ref. [25], $W = \sigma - c_\sigma I$ is not an entanglement witness in this case that $\sigma = \frac{1}{d_{AB}}$ is a diagonal state.

By Lemma 2, $\tilde{W}$ is separable. ☐

Conclusion.– We have shown a general method to construct finer and optimal EWS for a given EW. Furthermore, we find that there exists infinite EWs or an optimal EW for only an given entangled state. It is surprising that all EWs can be constructed from separable density matrices. A complete proof of Korbicz et al Phys. Rev. A **78** 062105 conjecture is interesting.

We would like to appreciate Prof. Guang Ping He and Rui-Gang Du for helpful discussions and suggestions. Bang-Hai Wang is grateful to Prof. Daowen Qiu and Prof. Guang Ping He for their excellent lectures on quantum computation and quantum information. This work is supported in part by the Key Project of NSFC-Guangdong Funds (No. U0935002).

---

[1] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81** 865 (2009).
[2] P. W. Shor, in *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (IEEE Computer Soceity Press, Los Alamos, CA, 1994), P. 124.
[3] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69** 2881 (1992).
[4] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70** 1895 (1993).
[5] A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67** 661 (1991).
[6] A. Peres, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77** 1413 (1996).
[7] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and M. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A* **210** 377 (1996).
[8] P. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A* **232** 333 (1997).
[9] M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **59** 4206 (1999).
[10] M. A. Nielsen and J. Kempe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** 5184 (2001).
[11] O. Rudolph, *Phys. Rev. A* **67** 032312 (2003).
[12] K. Chen and L. A. Wu, *Quant. Inf. Comp.* **3** 193 (2003).
[13] O. Gühne, P. Hyllus, O. Gittsovich and J. Eisert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** 130504 (2007).
[14] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, R. Jozsa, N. Linden, S. Popescu and R. Schack, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83** 1054 (1999).
[15] A. O. Pittenger and M. H. Rubin, *Phys. Rev. A* **62** 032313 (2000).
[16] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, *Phys. Lett. A* **223** 1 (1996).
[17] R. Augusiak, J. Bae, Ł. Czekaj and M. Lewenstein, *J. Phys. A* **44** 185308 (2011).
[18] S. Yu and N. L. Liu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95** 150504 (2005).
[19] J. Sperling and W. Vogel, *Phys. Rev. A* **79** 022318 (2009).
[20] L. Gurvits, *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, **69** 448 (2004).
[21] A. C. Doherty, P. A. Parrilo, and F. M. Spedalieri, *Phys. Rev. A* **69** 022308 (2004).
[22] J. Hou and Y. Guo, *Phys. Rev. A* **82** 052301 (2010).
[23] D. Chruściński, J. Pytel and G. Sarbicki, *Phys. Rev. A* **80** 062314 (2009).
[24] D. Chruściński and J. Pytel, *Phys. Rev. A* **82** 052310 (2010).
[25] B.-H. Wang and D.-Y. Long. will appear in PRA.
[26] R. F. Werner, *Phys. Rev. A* **40** 4277 (1989).
[27] M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, J. I. Cirac and P. Horodecki, *Phys. Rev. A* **62** 052310 (2000).
[28] M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
[29] K. Zyczkowski, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A 58, 883 (1998);
[30] G. Vidal and R. Tarrach, Phys. Rev. A 59, 141 (1999)

[31] L. Gurvits and H. Barnum, Phys. Rev. A 66, 062311 (2002).

[32] J. K. Korbicz, M. L. Almeida, J. Bae, M. Lewenstein and A. Acin, *Phys. Rev. A* **78** 062105 (2008).

[33] G. A. Raggio. *J. Phys. A* **39** 617 (2005).